



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/656,918	09/05/2003	Robin M. Forbes Jones	TAV-2044	8375
7590 Patrick J. Viccaro, Esquire Allegheny Technologies Incorporated 1000 Six PPG Place Pittsburgh, PA 15222-5479			EXAMINER ROE, JESSEE RANDALL	
			ART UNIT 1733	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 06/29/2011	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Ex parte ROBIN M. FORBES JONES, HENRY E. LIPPARD,
TIMOTHY A. STEPHENSON, ROBERT J. MYERS,
and DAVID J. BRADLEY

Appeal 2010-006845
Application 10/656,918
Technology Center 1700

Before CATHERINE Q. TIMM, BEVERLY A. FRANKLIN, and
MICHAEL P. COLAIANNI, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

FRANKLIN, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION ON APPEAL

Appellants appeal under 35 U.S.C. § 134 from the Examiner's rejection of claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10, 12-20, 32-34, 53, and 54. We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6. An oral hearing was held on May 10, 2011.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Claim 1 is representative of the subject matter on appeal and is set forth below:

1. An alloy having favorable fatigue resistance and comprising:

at least 20 weight percent cobalt;

32.7 to 37.3 weight percent nickel;

18.75 to 21.25 weight percent chromium;

8.85 to 10.65 weight percent molybdenum;

less than 30 ppm nitrogen;

less than 0.7 weight percent titanium;

at least one of at least 0.05 to 0.15 weight percent aluminum, at least 5 to 20 ppm calcium, at least 5 to 50 ppm magnesium, and at least 5 to 50 ppm cerium; and

no greater than 1.05 weight percent iron;

no greater than 0.035 weight percent carbon; and

wherein the alloy includes generally spherical oxide inclusions and is substantially free of titanium nitride and mixed metal carbonitride inclusion.

The prior art relied upon by the Examiner in rejecting the claims on appeal is:

Smith	3,356,542	Dec. 5, 1967
Ototani	4,820,485	Apr. 11, 1989
Thompson	6,342,068 B1	Jan. 29, 2002

THE REJECTIONS

1. Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10, 12, 16-20, 32-34, 53, and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Smith.
2. Claims 13-15 under § 103(a) as being obvious over Smith as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Ototani.
3. Claims 20, 32-34, and 54 are rejected under § 103(a) as being obvious over Smith as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Thompson.

ISSUES

Did the Examiner err in determining that the following teaching of Smith found at column 4, ll. 68-72, suggests “less than 30 ppm nitrogen” as recited in Appellants’ claim 1:

It is critically important that the alloy composition contain no more than 0.05% of carbon, boron, oxygen, nitrogen or beryllium, the total of these components being no more than 0.1%?

We answer this question in the affirmative and reverse.

ANALYSIS (with Findings of Fact and Principles of Law)

It is the Examiner’s position that the above-quoted teaching of Smith is a teaching of a range of from 0 to 500 ppm. Ans. 14.

On the other hand, Appellants’ position is that Smith’s disclosure describes merely an upper limit for nitrogen in the alloy of 500 ppm, and

does not teach a range of from 0 to 500 ppm. Br. 17. This position is supported by the Lippard Declaration, attached as Exhibit 1 of the Brief. Therein, in paragraph 13 of this Declaration, Mr. Lippard attests that the alloy of Smith would have included at least 50 ppm nitrogen because this is the minimum level of nitrogen found in a conventional MP35N alloy. Br. 20. During oral hearing, Appellants reiterated this position. Oral Hearing Transcript, pp. 4-7 (May 10, 2011).

In view of the above, we determine that the preponderance of evidence weighs in favor of Appellants' position. In arriving at this determination, we note that in the paragraph bridging pages 17-18 of the Answer, the Examiner admits that Smith does not demonstrate the benefit to limiting the nitrogen level to less than 30 ppm; yet requires of Appellants to provide evidence of unexpected results. This is improper. The Examiner has the initial burden of presenting a *prima facie* of case of unpatentability before the burden shifts to Appellants, who must then produce argument, with or without evidence, rebutting the initial case of unpatentability. *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 1445 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

Hence, for the reason discussed above, we agree with Appellants' arguments that the Examiner has not presented a *prima facie* case of obviousness. We, therefore, reverse each of the rejections (in the other rejections, the Examiner's reliance on the other references does not cure the deficiency of Smith).

Appeal 2010-006845
Application 10/656,918

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND DECISION

Each rejection is reversed.

REVERSED

cam